

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 were examined and reported in the Office Action. Claims 1, 8 and 15 are rejected. Claims 2-7 and 9-14 are objected to. Claims 1, 8 and 15 have been amended. Claims 2 and 9 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 3-8, and 10-15 remain.

Applicant requests reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

In the Action, the Examiner notes that acknowledgement is made of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file; further noting the information disclosure statement filed on 09/17/2003 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), but has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

In response, Applicant notes, on February 7, 2007, Applicant submitted, for filing in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, a response to a non-compliant information disclosure statement under 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2). In response, Applicant noted that the previously filed IDS was being resubmitted along with copies of the foreign patent documents identical to the copies originally submitted. Applicant further noted that the copies filed February 7, 2007 are identical in all respects to the copies filed September 17, 2003, and Applicant was unable to discern any illegible portions. As such, Applicant requests that the Examiner properly consider the references and initial the submitted Form 1449A/PTO.

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "102" has been used to designate both A_g and A_g^T , noting Figure 1. In response, Applicant has amended Figure 1 to show the designation of A_g^T by reference character "102", deleting the reference character "102" to A_g . In accordance, Applicant submits herewith, for filing in the above-identified U.S. Application, the "corrected drawing" labeled as "Replacement Sheet" regarding **Figure 1**.

Approval is respectfully requested.

In addition, the drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include reference characters not mentioned in the description, namely, “100”, “106”, “107”, 109” (figure 1); “204” (figure 2); “400”, “401”, “402” (figure 4; “500” (figure 5); and “600”, “602” and “603) (figure 6). In response, Applicant has amended the specification, namely the brief description of the drawings and the detailed description of the preferred embodiments to include the above-noted reference characters “100”, “106”, and “107” as noted by the Examiner. In addition, the reference characters not mentioned in the description, namely, 109” (figure 1); “204” (figure 2); “400”, “401”, “402” (figure 4); “500” (figure 5); and “600”, “602” and “603” (figure 6) have been deleted from the corresponding drawing pages in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) and in accordance with 37 CFR 1.84(c). In accordance, Applicant submits herewith, for filing in the above-identified U.S. Application, the “corrected drawings” labeled as “Replacement Sheet” regarding **Figure 1, Figure 2, Figure 4, Figure 5, and Figure 6.**

Approval is respectfully requested.

Additionally, the Examiner has indicated that **Figure 2** should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art--. In response, Applicant submits herewith, for filing in the above-identified U.S. Application, the “corrected drawing” labeled as “Replacement Sheet” regarding **Figure 2**, in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) and in accordance with 37 CFR 1.84(c).

Approval is respectfully requested.

The disclosure is objected to because of informalities, namely, in page 20, line 10, the recitation “ x_1, x_2, \dots, X_n ” is improper, the Examiner suggesting “ x_1, x_2, \dots, X_n ” be changed to “ x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n ”. In response, Applicant has changed “ x_1, x_2, \dots, X_n ” to “ x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n ” as suggested by the Examiner.

Approval is respectfully requested.



Claims 1, 8 and 15 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Ang.

Claims 1, 8 and 15 are also rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Sun.

However, the Examiner has indicated that Claims 2-7 and 9-14 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In this connection, Applicant has amended Claim 1 to correspond to Claim 2 rewritten in independent form. Similarly, Claim 8 has been amended to be rewritten as Claim 9 in independent form. Claims 2 and 9 have been cancelled. Finally, Claim 15 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of Claim 2. Although no indication of allowability of Claim 15 was provided, since Claim 15 sets forth the same method as provided in Claim 1, Applicant submits that by adding the limitations of Claim 2 to Claim 15, Claim 15 is allowable over the prior art for the same reasons as was the case with Claim 2.

Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 2-7 and 9-15, as they now stand, are allowable for the reasons given above.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending, namely claims 1, 3-8 and 10-15 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge those fees to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666. If a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this Application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN

Dated:

4/10/07

By:

Eric S. Hyman, Reg. No. 30,139

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(310) 207-3800

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING:

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class Mail, With Sufficient Postage, In An Envelope Addressed To: Mail Stop Amendments, Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Linda METZ April 10 2007 4/10/2007